UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/728,724	12/01/2000	Kiran Gurudutt Bellare	ORCL5672	5312

53156 7590 03/08/2006

YOUNG LAW FIRM, P.C.
4370 ALPINE RD.
STE. 106
PORTOLA VALLEY, CA 94028

EXAMINER	
CHOUDHURY, AZIZUL Q	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2145	

DATE MAILED: 03/08/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/728,724	BELLARE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Azizul Choudhury	2145	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *16 December 2005*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-20 and 23-44* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-20 and 23-44* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *01 December 2000* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Detailed Action

This office action is in response to the correspondence received on December 16, 2005.

Response to Amendment

Applicant's request for reconsideration of the finality of the rejection of the last Office action is persuasive and, therefore, the finality of that action is withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 13, 29 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The phrase "deep link" is indefinite. Appropriate corrections are required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-20 and 23-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pearson (US Pat No: US006023684A) in view of McMichael (US Pat No: US006941339B1).

1. With regards to claims 1, 18 and 35, Pearson teaches through McMichael a method for a first server to select content to be displayed on a computer accessing a Web site of a second server, comprising the steps of: collecting user identification data from the computer accessing the Web site (In Pearson's design, the client is equivalent to the claimed computer and the application service is equivalent to the claimed first server; see column 4, lines 1-18, Pearson); sending the collected user identification data to the first server (In Pearson, the data memory is equivalent to the claimed database; see column 4, lines 1-43, Pearson); retrieving user information corresponding to the user identification data from a database of user information accessible to the first server (see column 4, lines 19-43, Pearson); applying the retrieved user information to a rule base including a plurality of rules (see column 3, lines 8-29, McMichael); selecting content to be displayed on the second server's Web site based upon a result of the application of the retrieved user information to at least one of the plurality of rules, and causing the Web site to display the selected content to the accessing computer (In Pearson's design, the host is equivalent to the claimed second server, see column 4, lines 44-65, Pearson).

(While both Pearson and McMichael teach proxy based network service designs, Pearson's design does not disclose the use of rules. McMichael discloses a design that

allows for customized rules to be applied to user requests using on database information (see column 5, lines 29-63, McMichael). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art, during the time of the invention, to have combined the teachings of Pearson with those of McMichael, for the purpose of dynamically adjusting portal views accessed by the user (column 2, lines 21-32, McMichael)).

2. With regards to claims 2, 30, 34, and 36, Pearson teaches through McMichael a method wherein at least one of the plurality of rules is customizable (see column 6, lines 30-37, McMichael).

(While both Pearson and McMichael teach proxy based network service designs, Pearson's design does not disclose the use of rules. McMichael discloses a design that allows for customized rules to be applied to user requests using on database information (see column 5, lines 29-63, McMichael). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art, during the time of the invention, to have combined the teachings of Pearson with those of McMichael, for the purpose of dynamically adjusting portal views accessed by the user (column 2, lines 21-32, McMichael)).

3. With regards to claims 3, 19 and 37, Pearson teaches through McMichael a method wherein the user identification data is included in at least one file stored on the accessing computer (see column 12, line 30, Pearson).

(While both Pearson and McMichael teach proxy based network service designs, Pearson's design does not disclose the use of rules. McMichael discloses a design that

allows for customized rules to be applied to user requests using on database information (see column 5, lines 29-63, McMichael). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art, during the time of the invention, to have combined the teachings of Pearson with those of McMichael, for the purpose of dynamically adjusting portal views accessed by the user (column 2, lines 21-32, McMichael)).

4. With regards to claims 4, 20 and 38, Pearson teaches through McMichael a method wherein the at least one file is configured as a cookie (see column 12, line 30, Pearson).

(While both Pearson and McMichael teach proxy based network service designs, Pearson's design does not disclose the use of rules. McMichael discloses a design that allows for customized rules to be applied to user requests using on database information (see column 5, lines 29-63, McMichael). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art, during the time of the invention, to have combined the teachings of Pearson with those of McMichael, for the purpose of dynamically adjusting portal views accessed by the user (column 2, lines 21-32, McMichael)).

5. With regards to claim 5, Pearson teaches through McMichael a method wherein the causing step includes a step of sending the selected content to the second server (see column 4, lines 1-18, Pearson).

(While both Pearson and McMichael teach proxy based network service designs, Pearson's design does not disclose the use of rules. McMichael discloses a design that

allows for customized rules to be applied to user requests using on database information (see column 5, lines 29-63, McMichael). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art, during the time of the invention, to have combined the teachings of Pearson with those of McMichael, for the purpose of dynamically adjusting portal views accessed by the user (column 2, lines 21-32, McMichael)).

6. With regards to claim 6, Pearson teaches through McMichael a method wherein the second server further carries out a step of integrating the selected content into the Web site displayed to the user (see column 4, lines 44-65, Pearson).

(While both Pearson and McMichael teach proxy based network service designs, Pearson's design does not disclose the use of rules. McMichael discloses a design that allows for customized rules to be applied to user requests using on database information (see column 5, lines 29-63, McMichael). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art, during the time of the invention, to have combined the teachings of Pearson with those of McMichael, for the purpose of dynamically adjusting portal views accessed by the user (column 2, lines 21-32, McMichael)).

7. With regards to claims 7 and 23, Pearson teaches through McMichael a method wherein the second server further carries out a step of transmitting the selected content to the accessing computer and wherein a browser running on the accessing computer integrates the selected content into a currently displayed page of the Web site (see column 4, lines 44-65, Pearson).

(While both Pearson and McMichael teach proxy based network service designs, Pearson's design does not disclose the use of rules. McMichael discloses a design that allows for customized rules to be applied to user requests using on database information (see column 5, lines 29-63, McMichael). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art, during the time of the invention, to have combined the teachings of Pearson with those of McMichael, for the purpose of dynamically adjusting portal views accessed by the user (column 2, lines 21-32, McMichael)).

8. With regards to claims 8, 24 and 39, Pearson teaches through McMichael a method wherein the transmitting step is carried out via HTTP and TCP/IP (see column 6, lines 44-67, Pearson).

(While both Pearson and McMichael teach proxy based network service designs, Pearson's design does not disclose the use of rules. McMichael discloses a design that allows for customized rules to be applied to user requests using on database information (see column 5, lines 29-63, McMichael). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art, during the time of the invention, to have combined the teachings of Pearson with those of McMichael, for the purpose of dynamically adjusting portal views accessed by the user (column 2, lines 21-32, McMichael)).

9. With regards to claims 9 and 25, Pearson teaches through McMichael a method wherein the causing step includes a step of sending to the second server an address of

the selected content (Such means are well known in the art, see column 2, lines 33-51, Pearson).

(While both Pearson and McMichael teach proxy based network service designs, Pearson's design does not disclose the use of rules. McMichael discloses a design that allows for customized rules to be applied to user requests using on database information (see column 5, lines 29-63, McMichael). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art, during the time of the invention, to have combined the teachings of Pearson with those of McMichael, for the purpose of dynamically adjusting portal views accessed by the user (column 2, lines 21-32, McMichael)).

10. With regards to claims 10 and 26, Pearson teaches through McMichael a method wherein the second server carries out a step of fetching the selected content at the address sent by the first server and integrating the fetched selected content into a currently displayed page of the Web site (see column 2, lines 33-51 and column 4, lines 44-65, Pearson).

(While both Pearson and McMichael teach proxy based network service designs, Pearson's design does not disclose the use of rules. McMichael discloses a design that allows for customized rules to be applied to user requests using on database information (see column 5, lines 29-63, McMichael). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art, during the time of the invention, to have combined the teachings of Pearson with those of McMichael, for the purpose of dynamically adjusting portal views accessed by the user (column 2, lines 21-32, McMichael)).

11. With regards to claims 11 and 27, Pearson teaches through McMichael a method wherein the second server sends the address of the selected content to the accessing computer and wherein the accessing computer fetches the selected content at the address sent by the second server and integrates the fetched selected content into a currently displayed page of the Web site (see column 2, lines 33-51 and column 4, lines 44-65, Pearson).

(While both Pearson and McMichael teach proxy based network service designs, Pearson's design does not disclose the use of rules. McMichael discloses a design that allows for customized rules to be applied to user requests using on database information (see column 5, lines 29-63, McMichael). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art, during the time of the invention, to have combined the teachings of Pearson with those of McMichael, for the purpose of dynamically adjusting portal views accessed by the user (column 2, lines 21-32, McMichael)).

12. With regards to claims 12, 28 and 40, Pearson teaches through McMichael a method wherein the content includes at least one of an advertisement, a product recommendation and a link to another Web site (see column 5, lines 15-32, Pearson).

(While both Pearson and McMichael teach proxy based network service designs, Pearson's design does not disclose the use of rules. McMichael discloses a design that allows for customized rules to be applied to user requests using on database information (see column 5, lines 29-63, McMichael). Therefore, it would have been

obvious to one skilled in the art, during the time of the invention, to have combined the teachings of Pearson with those of McMichael, for the purpose of dynamically adjusting portal views accessed by the user (column 2, lines 21-32, McMichael)).

13. With regards to claims 13, 29 and 41, Pearson teaches through McMichael a method wherein the selected content includes a combination of the product recommendation and a deep link into said another Web site where the recommended product is featured (see column 5, lines 15-32, Pearson).

(While both Pearson and McMichael teach proxy based network service designs, Pearson's design does not disclose the use of rules. McMichael discloses a design that allows for customized rules to be applied to user requests using on database information (see column 5, lines 29-63, McMichael). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art, during the time of the invention, to have combined the teachings of Pearson with those of McMichael, for the purpose of dynamically adjusting portal views accessed by the user (column 2, lines 21-32, McMichael)).

14. With regards to claims 14, 30 and 42, Pearson teaches through McMichael a method wherein an applicability of at least one of the plurality of rules of the rule base is selectively limited by at least one parameter (see column 6, lines 30-37, McMichael).

(While both Pearson and McMichael teach proxy based network service designs, Pearson's design does not disclose the use of rules. McMichael discloses a design that allows for customized rules to be applied to user requests using on database

information (see column 5, lines 29-63, McMichael). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art, during the time of the invention, to have combined the teachings of Pearson with those of McMichael, for the purpose of dynamically adjusting portal views accessed by the user (column 2, lines 21-32, McMichael)).

15. With regards to claims 15, 31 and 43, Pearson teaches through McMichael a method wherein the at least one parameter includes time, date, geography, age, sex, income level, browser type and record of past purchases or inquiries (see column 1, line 54 – column 2, line 5, McMichael).

(While both Pearson and McMichael teach proxy based network service designs, Pearson's design does not disclose the use of rules. McMichael discloses a design that allows for customized rules to be applied to user requests using on database information (see column 5, lines 29-63, McMichael). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art, during the time of the invention, to have combined the teachings of Pearson with those of McMichael, for the purpose of dynamically adjusting portal views accessed by the user (column 2, lines 21-32, McMichael)).

16. With regards to claims 16, 32 and 44, Pearson teaches through McMichael a method further comprising the step of updating the database of user information based upon an activity of a user of the accessing computer (see column 4, lines 1-18, Pearson).

(While both Pearson and McMichael teach proxy based network service designs, Pearson's design does not disclose the use of rules. McMichael discloses a design that allows for customized rules to be applied to user requests using on database information (see column 5, lines 29-63, McMichael). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art, during the time of the invention, to have combined the teachings of Pearson with those of McMichael, for the purpose of dynamically adjusting portal views accessed by the user (column 2, lines 21-32, McMichael)).

17. With regard to claims 17 and 33, Pearson teaches through McMichael a method wherein the sending step sends a request for the selected content along with the collected user identification data (see column 4, lines 1-43, Pearson).

(While both Pearson and McMichael teach proxy based network service designs, Pearson's design does not disclose the use of rules. McMichael discloses a design that allows for customized rules to be applied to user requests using on database information (see column 5, lines 29-63, McMichael). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art, during the time of the invention, to have combined the teachings of Pearson with those of McMichael, for the purpose of dynamically adjusting portal views accessed by the user (column 2, lines 21-32, McMichael)).

Remarks

The correspondence received on December 16, 2005 has been carefully reviewed. After reviewing the previous office action in lieu of the latest correspondence,

the finality of the last office action has been withdrawn. A new search has been performed and the current office action has been compiled based on the latest prior art discovered.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Azizul Choudhury whose telephone number is (571) 272-3909. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jason Cardone can be reached on (571) 272-3933. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

AC

JASON CARDONE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER